

# SEXUAL SELECTION AND POPULATION DIVERGENCE II. DIVERGENCE IN DIFFERENT SEXUAL TRAITS AND SIGNAL MODALITIES IN FIELD CRICKETS (*TELEOGRYLLUS OCEANICUS*)

Sonia Pascoal<sup>1</sup>, Magdalena Mendrok<sup>2</sup>, Alastair J. Wilson<sup>3</sup>, John Hunt<sup>3,4</sup>, Nathan W. Bailey<sup>5,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, Downing Street, Cambridge, CB2 3EJ,  
United Kingdom*

<sup>2</sup> *Institute of Environmental Sciences, Jagellonian University, Gronostajowa 7, 30-387 Kraków,  
Poland*

<sup>3</sup> *Centre for Ecology and Conservation, School of Biosciences, University of Exeter, Cornwall  
Campus, TR10 9EZ, United Kingdom*

<sup>4</sup> *School of Science and Health and Hawkesbury Institute for the Environment, Western  
Sydney University, Penrith, NSW, 2751, Australia*

<sup>5</sup> *Centre for Biological Diversity, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, KY16 9TH, United  
Kingdom*

<sup>6</sup> *E-mail: nwb3@st-andrews.ac.uk*

**Running Title:** Divergence in Multiple Sexual Trait Modalities

**Data Archive Location:** Microsatellite, cuticular hydrocarbon and calling song data are  
archived on the Dryad Digital Repository at doi:10.5061/dryad.tb552. Additional  
morphometric data presented here will be archived upon acceptance.

## Abstract

Sexual selection can target many different types of traits. However, the relative influence of different sexually-selected traits during evolutionary divergence is poorly understood. We used the field cricket *Teleogryllus oceanicus* to quantify and compare how five traits from each of three sexual signal modalities and components diverge among allopatric populations: male advertisement song, cuticular hydrocarbon (CHC) profiles and forewing morphology. Population divergence was unexpectedly consistent: we estimated the among-population (genetic) variance-covariance matrix, **D**, for all 15 traits, and **D**<sub>max</sub> explained nearly two-thirds of its variation. CHC and wing traits were most tightly integrated, whereas song varied more independently. We modelled the dependence of among-population trait divergence on genetic distance estimated from neutral markers to test for signatures of selection vs. neutral divergence. For all three sexual trait types, phenotypic variation among populations was largely explained by a neutral model of divergence. Our findings illustrate how phenotypic integration across different types of sexual traits might impose constraints on the evolution of mating isolation and divergence via sexual selection.

**KEY WORDS:** acoustic communication, cuticular hydrocarbons, eigendecomposition, geometric morphometrics, multimodal signalling, sexual selection

## Introduction

The role of sexual selection in evolutionary diversification has been the subject of research scrutiny, because it is predicted to increase the evolutionary rate of traits that cause reproductive isolation such as sexual signals and mating preferences (Lande 1981; West-Eberhard 1983; Ritchie 2007; Kraaijeveld et al. 2011). If sexual selection causes rapid evolution of such traits in isolated populations, mismatches in sexual communication arising from genetic drift, ecological selection, or other processes will become amplified, and may ultimately decrease the likelihood of gene flow upon secondary contact. Such patterns can then be exacerbated by reinforcement, when genetic incompatibilities between lineages in secondary contact reinforce existing patterns of selection on mate recognition. Sexual selection therefore has the potential to play a two-part role in evolutionary diversification: first, by accelerating the elaboration of sexual signals, and second, by being the causal mechanism by which signal mismatches create mating barriers between taxa. Two critical parameters for empirically testing these ideas are therefore the amount of sexual trait divergence among populations, and the rate at which it evolves relative to other traits (Rodríguez et al. 2013, Wilkins et al. 2016).

Studies examining the relationship between sexual selection and divergence frequently test how strongly genetic divergence correlates with divergence in male sexual trait values, or, less commonly, female preferences (e.g. Gage et al. 2002; Masta and Maddison 2002; Huang and Rabosky 2014; Hudson and Price 2014). Although drift can independently influence both genetic structure and phenotypic divergence, the rationale of such

approaches is that divergence in sexual traits should correlate with reproductive isolation among populations or higher taxonomic groupings (e.g. Mendelson and Shaw, 2005). This implies a possible role for sexual selection to elaborate sexual trait divergence above and beyond what is expected by neutral processes (Ritchie 2007); a prediction that follows is that phenotypic divergence is expected to be greater for sexual traits with a greater influence on reproductive isolation (Rodríguez et al. 2013). Secondly, if sexual traits evolve more rapidly due to coevolutionary feedback dynamics of sexual selection (Lande 1981), these phenotypes should show greater divergence than those not subject to such selection (Funk et al. 2009). However, few studies evaluate patterns of divergence among different traits that might be targets of sexual selection, despite ample evidence that sexual selection acts on traits in more than one modality within a species, for example olfactory, acoustic, visual or tactile signals (Møller and Pomiankowski 1993, Hebets and Papaj 2005, Uetz et al. 2009, Girard et al. 2011). In addition, sexual selection can act upon different components of complex or multicomponent signalling traits, for example morphologies and behaviours which together generate a conspicuous acoustic or visual signal (Pomiankowski and Iwasa 1993; Rowe 1999). Given the potential multivariate, complex nature of sexual traits, evaluating which are most likely to be targeted by sexual selection during evolutionary elaboration or divergence remains challenging.

Testing for signatures of selection and drift in more than one sexual trait simultaneously can illuminate constraints on the evolution of reproductive isolation via signal divergence. Here we address this in a field cricket system (*Teleogryllus oceanicus*) by testing the correspondence among patterns of phenotypic divergence in different male sexual traits—acoustic advertisement signals, cuticular hydrocarbons, and morphology of sound-producing

wing structures—among allopatric populations, and by using this data with estimates of putatively neutral genetic divergence to subsequently test for signals of selection vs. neutral processes. Our key interest is the correspondence, or not, of population divergence among different sexual traits: Is population divergence of a similar magnitude across trait types, and do selection or other neutral processes similarly exaggerate different trait types? Do individual traits tend to be more integrated within each modality or component than they are between them, or are processes affecting divergence in one modality or component likely to constrain evolutionary responses in another?

*T. oceanicus* is found in northern and eastern Australia and Oceania (Otte and Alexander 1983). As with most grylline crickets, males produce conspicuous acoustic signals which function in mate recognition, mate location, close-range courtship, and aggression (Figure 1a) (Alexander 1967). The genus *Teleogryllus* has been a popular system for examining sexual selection on male song traits and the role of song in establishing reproductive barriers (e.g. Hoy et al. 1973, Simmons et al. 2001, Brooks et al. 2005). However, field crickets also express cuticular hydrocarbons (CHCs). CHCs are common in arthropods, and consist of long-chain waxy molecules thought to have evolved under selection for desiccation resistance (Figure 1b). Crickets can discriminate subtle variations in CHCs, the sexes express different CHC profiles, and there is evidence that both males and females discriminate among potential mates and thereby exert sexual selection on the composition of CHC blends (Tregenza and Wedell 1997, Thomas and Simmons 2009, 2010, Steiger et al. 2013, Capodeanu-Nägler et al. 2014, Simmons et al. 2014). Finally, acoustical properties of cricket songs are determined not only by variation in behaviours that produce temporal patterns of chirps such as wing closure rate, but also by structural features of the forewing

resonators that produce acoustic signals (Figure 1c) (Alexander 1962, Simmons and Ritchie 1996, Bennet-Clark 2003, Bailey et al. 2007, Moradian and Walker 2008). The male forewings of *T. oceanicus* contain derived sound-producing structures, including two oscillating membranes bounded by thickened, modified wing veins (Ragge 1955). These morphological structures are also expected to be targets of sexual selection, although the shape and intensity of that selection may differ from that on song, owing to the additional behavioural motor patterns that combine to produce song phenotypes (Klingenberg et al. 2010).

This study combines previously-reported (Pascoal et al. 2016) and new data from allopatric populations of *T. oceanicus* to examine male calling song traits, CHC profiles, and forewing morphometrics measured in common garden laboratory conditions. Patterns of phenotypic divergence were then compared with population genetic divergence. Our analyses tested several hierarchical predictions. First, we predicted, and confirmed, that phenotypic trait values vary across populations. The second prediction was that the three trait types show corresponding patterns of phenotypic divergence among populations. The third was that comparing this divergence to expectations under a neutral processes model derived from neutral genetic markers would reveal a role for sexual selection in promoting variation among populations in all three trait types. We report ample evidence for population divergence within each modality and trait component, and unexpected phenotypic integration (i.e. phenotypic correlation) across all three. However, phenotypic divergence was largely consistent with expectations under neutral processes, and patterns of genetic variation were less consistent with a stepping-stone model of island colonisation than they were with simple isolation-by-distance. We discuss the evolutionary implications of

phenotypic integration and patterns of divergence across these three sexual traits.

## *Methods*

### **CRICKET SAMPLING AND MAINTENANCE**

Previously-published data analysed here include microsatellite-based population genetic data, male calling song recordings, and CHC profiles (Pascoal et al. 2016). These are archived on the Dryad Digital Repository (doi:10.5061/dryad.tb552). The calling song parameters from Daintree and Townsville, Australia, that we analyse here were additionally reported in Bailey and Macleod (2014). Detailed methodological descriptions for microsatellite, calling song and CHC analyses are provided in Pascoal et al. (2016), so we briefly summarise the procedures below. To these data we have added a morphometric analysis of male forewing resonating structures.

We sampled seven *T. oceanicus* populations distributed across eastern Australia and the Pacific. Stock populations were maintained in the lab at approximately 25 °C on a 12:12 light:dark cycle in a temperature-controlled chamber. Crickets were kept in 16 L plastic containers and fed Excel Junior and Dwarf rabbit pellets, provisioned with cardboard egg cartons for shelter and moistened cotton wool. Maintenance was carried out twice weekly. When experiments required crickets to be isolated, they were placed into small 118 mL plastic cups provisioned and maintained as above.

### **POPULATION GENETICS**

Twenty-four wild-caught individuals from each population were screened using a panel of

10 polymorphic microsatellite loci (Beveridge and Simmons 2005, Pascoal et al. 2016). DNA extraction details, primer sequences and PCR conditions are provided in Pascoal et al. (2016), and samples were run on an ABI 3730 sequencer at Edinburgh Genomics. We calculated estimates of  $F_{ST}$  and  $F'_{ST}$  (Peakall and Smouse 2012) and constructed population-pairwise genetic distance matrices for subsequent analyses using GenePop v.4.0.10 (Raymond and Rousset 1995; Rousset 2008), FSTAT v.1.2 (Goudet 1995) and the Microsoft Excel add-in GenAlEx v.6.5 (Peakall and Smouse 2012; Verity and Nichols 2014).

## **TRAIT QUANTIFICATION**

### *Calling Song*

We previously reared crickets in a common garden environment in the lab and recorded the calling songs of between 18-21 adult males per population (Bailey and Macleod 2014; Pascoal et al. 2016). Stock populations experienced at least two generations of lab rearing, thereby reducing the potential for maternal effects arising from field conditions. Recordings were made using a Sennheiser ME66 microphone under red light between 23 – 27 °C during the crickets' dark cycle, and we only analysed males from which we could obtain ten complete song phrases. We used Sony Sound Forge 7.0a to quantify 15 song traits.

### *Cuticular Hydrocarbons*

We previously analysed the CHC profiles of 768 adult male crickets between the ages of 7 – 10 days post-eclosion (Pascoal et al. 2016). Frozen crickets were thawed and immersed in 4 mL of HPLC-grade hexane (Fisher Scientific) for five minutes. 2 µL samples of a 100 µL aliquot reconstituted in hexane with a 10ppm pentadecane standard were processed in an Agilent 7890 gas chromatographer and an Agilent 5975B mass spectrometer (GC-MS) on a



30 m x 0.25 mm internal diameter DB-WAX column with helium as a carrier gas. GC-MS conditions are described fully in Pascoal et al. (2016). We estimated the relative abundance of 26 CHC peaks using MSD CHEMSTATION v.E.02.00.493 (Agilent). Ion 57 was the target and we corrected peak abundances by dividing each by the abundance of the pentadecane standard. Log<sub>10</sub> transformed relative peak abundances were used in subsequent statistical analyses.

### *Forewing Morphometrics*

Shape and relative placement of sound-producing structures on male forewings were measured using landmark-based geometric morphometrics (Webster and Sheets 2010). We removed the right forewings from crickets that were used for the CHC analyses above (Pascoal et al. 2016) and mounted them between two microscope slides (n = 13 exclusions for torn or mislabelled wings). Wings were photographed using a Leica DFC295 digital camera attached to a Leica M60 dissecting microscope, and a 1 mm grid scale was included in photographs to facilitate later measurement. Using the program tpsDIG v.2.16 (Rohlf 2005), 11 landmarks were placed at prominent vein junctions defining the harp, scraper and mirror of the male forewing (Ragge 1955). Figure 1 illustrates the landmarks, which are modelled after those used in a morphometric study of a closely-related cricket, *Gryllus firmus* (Klingenberg et al. 2010). Several programs from the Integrated Morphometrics Package were used to superimpose landmark data from all samples and quantify shape variation using Procrustes distances (Zelditch 2012). Landmark data was combined from all individuals into a common dataset, and the program CoordGen6f (Zelditch 2012) was used to produce Procrustes distances. From this, we calculated principal components and scores describing the shape of resonating structures for each individual using PCAGEN6f (Rohlf and

209 Slice 1990, Zelditch 2012).

210

211 Harp and mirror surface areas were calculated by measuring the area of the polygon

212 enclosing each wing structure (Figure 1). This technique was adopted for convenience, and

213 we validated it in a randomly-chosen subset of 50 wings for which the exact outlines of the

214 harp and mirror were drawn manually and the surface areas calculated. The validation

215 showed a strong positive correlation between the two measurement techniques (see

216 Supplemental Figure S1), so analysis proceeded using the original polygon-based

217 measurements. A further validation was performed on the same set of 50 wings, in which

218 we placed landmarks on the original photos a second time, and re-calculated harp and

219 mirror surface area. The results of this validation (see Supplemental Figure S1) similarly

220 indicated confidence in the precision of our protocol. Landmark placement and

221 measurement for the validation were performed blind to sample identity.

222

## 223 **ANALYSES**

### 224 *Population Variation in Sexual Traits*

225 We focused on a subset of five key sub-traits from each modality and component to

226 facilitate statistical modelling of divergence across populations, and to test how such

227 patterns of divergence did or did not correspond among the three types of traits. Wing (n =

228 755) and CHC (n = 768) traits were quantified from the same individuals in the previously

229 described experiment, which examined social environment effects, while calling song traits

230 were quantified from a different set of individuals (n = 137) (Pascoal et al. 2016). The five

231 calling song traits were: number of long chirps, number of short chirps, carrier frequency,

232 long chirp-short chirp interval, and inter-song interval. We chose these traits because they

were found to be the main targets of selection in a multivariate selection analysis of calling song in the closely-related sister species *T. commodus* (Brooks et al. 2005). The five CHC traits comprised the first 5 PCs based on the same extraction implemented in Pascoal et al. (2016), which cumulatively explained 71.9% of variation in CHC profiles (PC1 = 38.4%, PC2 = 16.5%, PC3 = 7.3%, PC4 = 5.1%, PC5 = 4.6%). Landmark-based morphometric data captured information about the shape and relative placement of key wing vein junctions independent of the absolute size of the surrounding features. However, harp and mirror surface area also have an important influence on male carrier frequency (Alexander 1962, Simmons and Ritchie 1996, Bennet-Clark 2003, Bailey et al. 2007, Moradian and Walker 2008), so our five wing morphology traits included absolute measures of both harps and mirrors, plus the first three relative warps which cumulatively explained just over 50% of the variation in forewing shape, independent of size (variance explained by relative warps for wing landmarks: RW1 = 25.1%, RW2 = 15.0%, RW3 = 10.2%).

The experiment described in Pascoal et al. (2016) examined the effects of a social environment manipulation on CHC expression. However, this effect was not of direct interest here and sample sizes were balanced across treatments in the experiment, so for the CHC and wing morphometric data we did not model the social environment (or incubator, for which we found no significant effect in the previous study (Pascoal et al. (2016))). Each trait was divided by its standard deviation (across all populations), giving a standard unit variance, to ensure that they all entered models scale-independent.

We used canonical variates analyses (CVA) implemented in SPSS v.21 to visualise patterns of population variation in song, CHC, and wing traits. This was only done for purposes of

illustrating overall patterns of phenotypic differentiation among populations, as the five individual traits selected for each trait type included existing latent variables extracted from PC analyses. CVA maximises variation among pre-defined groups and it is a useful tool for visualising differences among such groups. We therefore modelled “population” as a factor, and plotted scores from the first two canonical variates axes for each trait type. In addition, we used CVAgen v.6l to visualise the main sources of variation in wing landmark data across populations. The latter analysis used all relative warps from the landmark-based morphometric approach described above, and wing landmark variation was regressed on the first significant canonical variate axis to produce a Procrustes deformation grid and vectors describing the relative magnitude and direction of landmark displacement among populations. The scaling factor was set to 0.2.

#### *Comparison of Phenotypic Divergence in Different Traits*

We used REML linear models to formally evaluate among population differences within each trait type, and facilitate subsequent comparison against population divergence in individual traits. We first fit three multivariate linear models using REML, one for each modality (song, CHC, wing morphology). In each case, the five observed traits (in standard deviation units) were treated as response variables with population as a predictor (i.e. analogous to a classical MANOVA analysis). Given evidence of population effects on each modality (see Results), univariate REML models were used to test the significance of population effects on individual traits.

We then estimated the among-population (genetic) variance covariance matrix (**D**) for the complete set of 15 traits. Although **D** is defined as the among-trait covariance matrix of

population specific means, we chose to re-estimate these parameters using MCMC rather than REML to better carry statistical uncertainty forward to subsequent analytical steps. Thus, we re-estimated population specific trait means using a multivariate (15 trait) linear model fitted in MCMCglmm, with a single (fixed) factor of Population specified for each trait. The model was run with default priors for 20,000 iterations with a burn-in of 5,000 iterations and a thinning interval of 10. Model convergence was checked visually and by comparison of posterior means for each parameter to the REML estimates (which were very similar in all cases). **D** was then determined as the among-trait covariance matrix of the trait means. We defined credible intervals (CIs) as the 95% highest posterior density interval of the posterior for each element of **D**, and consider off-diagonal elements (i.e. covariances) to be significant at  $P < 0.05$  if the CI did not span zero. We note that CIs for diagonal elements (i.e. variances) are constrained to positive space so cannot be used for inference, but among-population variance was already tested in the REML analysis. To better interpret the covariance structure of **D** matrix, we subjected it to eigendecomposition and also rescaled to the correlation matrix **D<sub>cor</sub>**. We also calculated the traces (with CI) of the 5x5 submatrices of **D** corresponding to each trait type to test whether among-population divergence was different between the three trait types.

### *Selection Versus Neutral Divergence of Phenotypes*

To determine whether patterns of among-population divergence in song, CHC and wing traits were consistent with a neutral model we used several complementary approaches. First, using the point estimates of the multivariate phenotypic mean (from the MCMC model described above), we calculated the phenotypic distance matrix (as the Euclidean distance in 15 dimensional trait space) among populations and tested whether this was correlated

305 with the microsatellite-based  $F_{ST}$  and  $F'_{ST}$  distance matrices (where  $F'_{ST}$  scales from 0 to 1).  
 306 Second, we used Mantel tests to check for correlation of the phenotypic distance matrix  
 307 (and the microsatellite distance matrices) with geographic distance. Geographic distances  
 308 among all population pairs were calculated using the Great Circle Mapper  
 309 ([www.gcmap.com](http://www.gcmap.com)), under two putative models of cricket dispersal and colonisation. The  
 310 first calculated point-to-point distances between population pairs assuming direct,  
 311 unimpeded movement from one location to the other, whereas the second calculated  
 312 pairwise distances assuming an island-hopping model in which crickets migrated from  
 313 coastal/mainland populations in Australia across successive Pacific islands. Patterns of allelic  
 314 diversity in this species are consistent with serial bottlenecks experienced by founding  
 315 propagules of crickets that dispersed from west to east across Oceania (Tinghitella et al.  
 316 2011). The second geographic distance model accounted for the different geographic  
 317 structure expected under such a scenario by assuming free movement of crickets among the  
 318 three mainland Australian populations, while constraining distance calculations involving  
 319 island populations to the following sequence: mainland → Fiji → Mangaia → Tahiti →  
 320 Hawaii. Such a sequence might be expected if crickets accompanied humans during early  
 321 migrations across Oceania, or where range expansion occurred in a stepping-stone fashion.  
 322  
 323 Finally, we followed the mixed-model approach described in Pascoal et al. (2016) to test  
 324 whether there was more among-population variance than expected under a neutral model.  
 325 For each trait, we fitted a mixed model using REML in which the phenotype was predicted  
 326 by a single fixed effect of the mean and a random effect of population. We assumed  
 327 populations have diverged neutrally (i.e., under neutral processes alone), such that levels of  
 328 the random effects are drawn from a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance, to be

estimated, of  $V_{POP(neutral)}$ . Provided the microsatellite data provide an unbiased expectation of neutral divergence, then the expected covariance between a pair of observations, one on an individual in population  $i$  and one on an individual in population  $j$ , is equal to  $(1 - F'_{STij}) * V_{POP(neutral)}$ . For each trait this model was then compared to one in which a second random effect of population was added to account for additional among-population variance above that expected under neutrality ( $V_{POP(sel)}$ ). We assumed that twice the difference in model log-likelihoods (LnL) is distributed as a 50:50 mix of  $\chi^2_1$  and  $\chi^2_0$  (following Visscher 2006), with a significant improvement in fit being indicative of selection contributing to total among-population variance. As also noted in Pascoal et al (2016), we stress that the asymptotic approximation of the test statistic to a  $\chi^2$  distribution may not give reliable results with only seven levels (i.e. populations) for each random effect. Thus, while  $P$  values are provided they should be interpreted cautiously.

## Results

### POPULATION VARIATION IN SEXUAL TRAITS

Table 1 shows the results of multivariate fixed effect models and the univariate fixed effect models for each of the 15 traits. The multivariate model showed a clear difference in song traits across populations and the univariate models confirm that all traits contribute significantly to this overall multivariate effect (Table 1). There were also significant differences in the CHC profiles of males across populations in the multivariate model, and each of the five vectors describing CHC expression contributed to this overall multivariate effect (Table 1). Similarly, multivariate analysis showed that wing morphology varied significantly across populations (Table 1). Univariate analyses confirmed that the geometric

shape of the wings (Rw1-3), as well as mirror and harp area, significantly contributed to this overall multivariate effect (Table 1). Supplemental Table S1 reports details of the canonical variates analyses implemented to visualise population variation in each trait.

## POPULATION DIVERGENCE IN DIFFERENT TRAIT TYPES

Table 2 presents the among-population variance-covariance matrix, **D**, for the five traits contributing to each modality. The among-population variances in each modality are provided along the diagonal of this matrix and the sum of these estimates within each modality (the trace) provides an estimate of the total amount of divergence of traits in each modality. The estimated amount of divergence was greatest in wing morphology (1.311, 95% CIs: 1.187, 1.501), followed by song traits (1.281, 95% CIs: 1.203, 1.950) and then CHC traits (1.139, 95% CIs: 1.029, 1.316). However, overlapping credible intervals indicate there were no significant differences in the amount of divergence between the three trait types. The mean magnitude of correlations calculated using point estimates from Table 2 was 0.477 within types, and 0.507 between types. However, these were statistically indistinguishable using an anti-conservative *t*-test (2-tailed *t*-test:  $t = -0.528$ ,  $P = 0.599$ ). The magnitudes of within-type trait correlations were also similar when disaggregated by trait type: they were 0.369 for song traits, 0.590 for CHCs and 0.472 for wings, and again indistinguishable in an anti-conservative test (one-way ANOVA:  $F_{2,27} = 1.264$ ,  $P = 0.299$ ).

Table 3 presents the eigendecomposition of **D**. We retained the first six vectors from this decomposition for interpretation, which collectively explained >99.9% of the variation in **D**. The dominant vector (**D**<sub>max</sub>) explained 63.5% of this variance and was significantly loaded to all CHC traits and four out of five wing morphology traits. In contrast, for song traits only the



number of long chirps and the number of short chirps were significantly loaded to  $D_{\max}$  (Table 3).

## TESTING FOR A SIGNAL OF SEXUAL SELECTION

Using Mantel tests, we compared the multivariate divergence in trait means across types to geographic distance matrices to determine if mean phenotypic divergence could be explained by the degree of geographical isolation. We used two different geographic distance matrices: the first was based on the shortest physical distance between population pairs, while the second was based on the hypothetical west-east island hopping colonization route proposed by Tinghitella *et al.* (2011). In both cases, mean trait divergence was significantly correlated with geographic distance (physical distance:  $r = 0.738$ ,  $P = 0.010$ ; island hopping:  $r = 0.554$ ,  $P = 0.010$ ), although the correlation was weaker in the latter scenario.

Univariate mixed models comparing the among population divergence expected under neutral divergence (based on the  $F'_{ST}$  matrix across populations) to a model that allows additional among population divergence (i.e. implicating a role for selection) are presented in Supplemental Table S2. Significance of these models could be taken as evidence that neutral processes alone are insufficient to explain divergence between populations for a given trait. However, for all traits, the neutral model adequately explained population divergence. Collectively, these analyses suggest that drift coupled to restricted gene flow is the likeliest explanation for most divergence in traits across populations. In support of this argument, a comparison of the multivariate divergence in trait means to the  $F'_{ST}$  matrix showed that these matrices were significantly positively correlated ( $r = 0.764$ ,  $P = 0.010$ ).

400

## 401 *Discussion*

402 Causally linking the process of sexual selection with patterns of phenotypic differentiation is  
403 a fundamental challenge in evolutionary and behavioural research. Key to this is  
404 understanding the form and features of total sexual selection; that is, the combined effects  
405 of episodes of sexual selection arising from discrete mechanisms such as male-male  
406 competition and female choice, or episodes of sexual selection occurring at different  
407 timescales or through different sexual traits (Hunt et al. 2009). On a trait-by-trait basis, the  
408 shape of sexual selection might be expected to differ among modalities and among trait  
409 components, owing to variable constraints imposed by other sources of selection and  
410 genetic architectures, and thus provoke disjointed evolutionary responses (Greig et al.  
411 2015). Our results clearly indicate that *T. oceanicus* populations show phenotypic  
412 divergence in sexually-selected traits. In addition, the three trait types—male calling song,  
413 CHCs and wing morphology—show evidence of phenotypic divergence at roughly equal  
414 levels. Populations diverge in a fully multivariate way, with the major axis of overall  
415 differentiation in **D** loading on all three trait types.

416

417 The fact that a signal of selection was undetectable for all three sexual traits was  
418 unexpected, particularly in view of the finding that female preferences for male calling song  
419 vary across other populations of the same species (Simmons et al. 2001). Numerous studies  
420 have documented mate choice for all three types of traits in field crickets; their use as  
421 exemplars in sexual selection research is well-established. A potential explanation may lie in  
422 the fact that most studies infer the action of sexual selection (a) within populations (b) using

mate choice experiments and (c) while keeping constant other potential sources of selection such as fecundity or ecological selection. Studies that demonstrate causal links between sexual selection, an evolutionary response to that selection, and patterns of phenotypic diversification are surprisingly uncommon, given theoretical expectations about the rapid rate of evolution by sexual selection (Svensson and Gosden 2007). Thus, while there is an abundance of evidence that sexual selection operates on a wide variety of traits in a multitude of organisms, extending that insight to demonstrate its causal role in promoting diversification is a challenge that has largely remained unmet. A recent meta-analysis highlights the importance of this conceptual distinction, finding that absolute phenotypic divergence in female preferences for male secondary sexual traits best predicts patterns of diversification of those traits, rather than the intensity of selection operating on the traits (Rodríguez et al. 2013).

435

Research on multimodal and multicomponent sexual selection is still relatively underdeveloped (Coleman 2009, Prokop and Drobniak 2016), but several recent studies have examined the form and intensity of sexual selection on different types of signalling traits within a single population or species. For instance, a population of the lark bunting *Calamospiza melanocorys* experienced highly variable sexual selection pressures on multiple size and plumage colouration traits across different years (Chaine and Lyon 2008). Other studies have examined different targets of sexual selection in more than one population. For example, closely-related forms of the flycatcher *Monarcha castaneiventris* in the Solomon Islands behaviourally discriminate male plumage and song characters, and both contribute to premating isolation (Uy et al. 2008). In a similar study, Veltsos et al. (2011) simultaneously estimated sexual selection on male calling song and olfactory profiles in the

fruit fly *Drosophila montana*. Both traits were targets of sexual selection, but the form of selection differed between them, and also between two populations (Veltos et al. 2011). A recent study tested the relationship between acoustic signals in a sister species of field cricket, *Teleogryllus commodus*, and morphological features of male forewings that contribute to their resonant properties (Pitchers et al. 2014). Pitchers et al. (2014) found that wing morphology and acoustic signal properties covaried with differing strength in different populations of this species, but that overall covariance was minimal and appeared unrelated to patterns of population divergence. Such a pattern may be influenced by a greater degree of lability in behavioural traits compared to morphological traits which are fixed during development (Pitchers et al. 2014, Ower et al. 2016).

In this context, we would have predicted that behaviour associated with the production of calling song in *T. oceanicus*, i.e. the temporal dynamics of wing opening and closure, could play a more important role in responses to sexual selection than the structural wing features determining carrier frequency of male song. Although the overall magnitude of population divergence in each sexual trait was similar, the observation that song traits showed the lowest level of phenotypic integration, i.e. did not load as strongly or significantly onto  $D_{\max}$  as wing or CHC traits, supports this idea. A potential explanation is that the development of male wing structures may be less susceptible to the influence of environmental noise compared to motor neurons, central pattern generators and sensory apparatus involved in the behavioural production of song, and for CHCs, the direction of evolutionary change might be more heavily influenced by stabilising natural selection on CHC composition, which plays an important role in desiccation resistance (Foley and Telonis-Scott 2011). Apart from these differences, male *T. oceanicus* traits generally covaried within

and between modalities in a consistent manner in our study, suggesting that unconstrained axes of variation capable of independently responding to selection might be relatively minor.

## *Conclusion*

Despite progress documenting the action of sexual selection in multimodal and multicomponent signals modalities across taxa (Candolin 2003), it remains challenging to test whether different sexually selected traits diverge among populations in a uniform versus inconsistent manner. Such data can provide an important step towards establishing the relative contributions of different sexual traits to evolutionary diversification in species where selection potentially targets more than one sexual signal. Our results suggest that phenotypic integration across multiple sexual traits can act as a significant evolutionary constraint. Traits least constrained by genetic correlation and countervailing natural selection might be behaviours that can be flexibly adjusted, such as wing movements associated with acoustic signals in *T. oceanicus*, but we did not find evidence that selection acting on these has contributed to patterns of phenotypic divergence among allopatric populations. Instead, neutral processes such as drift appear to have played a dominant role in generating population differences in the phenotypic values of all three sexual traits.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We are grateful to the following people for assistance with cricket sampling, rearing and analyses: William Bailey, Stephen Blanksby, David Forbes, Benjamin Freeman, Audrey Grant, Brian Gray, Simon Hodge, Glenda Jones, Rhedyn Ollerynshaw, John Rotenberry, Suzanne

495 Vardy, Paris Veltsos and Marlene Zuk. The Sanger Sequencing Centre at the Edinburgh  
496 Genomics Institute assisted with genetic analysis. Funding was provided by Natural  
497 Environment Research Council grants to N.W.B. (NE/G014906/1, NE/L011255/1,  
498 NE/I027800/1), a University of California Pacific Rim Research Grant to N.W.B.  
499 (08.T.PRRP.05.0029), an Erasmus exchange grant to support M.M., a University Royal  
500 Society Fellowship and Royal Society Equipment Grant to J.H., and a BBSRC David Phillips  
501 Fellowship to A.J.W. The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

502

### 503 LITERATURE CITED

504

505 Alexander, R. D. 1962. Evolutionary change in cricket acoustical communication. *Evolution*  
506 16:443-467.

507

508 Alexander, R. D. 1967. Acoustical communication in arthropods. *Annual Reviews in*  
509 *Entomology* 12:495-526.

510

511 Bailey, N. W., D. T. Gwynne, W. V. Bailey, and M. G. Ritchie. 2007. Multiple differences in  
512 calling songs and other traits between solitary and gregarious Mormon crickets from  
513 allopatric mtDNA clades. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 7:5.

514

515 Bailey, N. W., and E. Macleod. 2014. Socially flexible female choice and premating isolation  
516 in field crickets (*Teleogryllus* spp.). *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 27:170-180.

517

518 Bennet-Clark, H. C. 2003. Wing resonances in the Australian field cricket *Teleogryllus*

519           *oceanicus*. The Journal of Experimental Biology 206:1479-1496.

520

521   Beveridge, M., and L. W. Simmons. 2005. Microsatellite loci for the Australian field cricket

522           *Teleogryllus oceanicus* and their cross-utility in *Teleogryllus commodus*. Molecular

523           Ecology Notes 5:733-735.

524

525   Brooks, R., J. Hunt, M. W. Blows, M. J. Smith, L. F. Bussière, and M. D. Jennions. 2005.

526           Experimental evidence for multivariate stabilizing sexual selection. Evolution 59:871-

527           880.

528

529   Candolin, U. 2003. The use of multiple cues in mate choice. Biological Reviews 78:575-595.

530

531   Capodeanu-Nägler, A., J. Rapkin, S. K. Sakaluk, J. Hunt, and S. Steiger. 2014. Self-recognition

532           in crickets via on-line processing. Current Biology 24:R1117-R1118.

533

534   Chaine, A. S., and B. E. Lyon. 2008. Adaptive plasticity in female mate choice dampens sexual

535           selection on male ornaments in the lark bunting. Science 319:459-462.

536

537   Coleman, S. W. 2009. Taxonomic and sensory biases in the mate-choice literature: there are

538           far too few studies of chemical and multimodal communication. Acta Ethologica

539           12:45-48.

540

541   Foley, B. R., and M. Telonis-Scott. 2011. Quantitative genetic analysis suggests causal

542           association between cuticular hydrocarbon composition and desiccation survival in

543           *Drosophila melanogaster*. Heredity 106:68-77.

544

545   Funk, W. C., D. C. Cannatella, and M. J. Ryan. 2009. Genetic divergence is more tightly

546           related to call variation than landscape features in the Amazonian frogs *Physalaemus*

547           *petersi* and *P. freibergi*. Journal of Evolutionary Biology 22:1839-1853.

548

549   Gage, M. J. G., G. A. Parker, S. Nylin, and C. Wiklund. 2002. Sexual selection in speciation in

550           mammals, butterflies and spiders. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series

551           B 269:2309-2316.

552

553   Girard, M. B., M. M. Kasumovic, and D. O. Elias. 2011. Multi-modal courtship in the peacock

554           spider, *Maratus Volans* (O.P.-Cambridge, 1874). PLoS ONE e25390.

555

556   Goudet, J. 1995. FSTAT (version 1.2) A computer program to calculate F-statistics. Journal of

557           Heredity 86:385-386.

558

559   Greig, E. I., D. T. Baldassare, and M. S. Webster. 2015. Differential rates of phenotypic

560           introgression are associated with male behavioral responses to multiple signals.

561           Evolution 69:2602-2612.

562

563   Hebets, E. A., and D. R. Papaj. 2005. Complex signal function: developing a framework of

564           testable hypotheses. Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 57:197-214.

565

566   Hoy, R. R., J. Hahn, and R. C. Paul. 1973. Hybrid cricket auditory behavior: evidence for



567           genetic coupling in animal communication. *Science* 195:82-84.

568

569   Huang, H., and D. L. Rabosky. 2014. Sexual selection and diversification: re-examining the

570           correlation between dichromatism and speciation rate in birds. *American Naturalist*

571           184:E101-E114.

572

573   Hudson, E. J., and T. D. Price. 2014. Pervasive reinforcement and the role of sexual selection

574           in biological speciation. *Journal of Heredity* 105:821-833.

575

576   Hunt, J., C. J. Breuker, J. A. Sadowski, and A. J. Moore. 2009. Male-male competition, female

577           mate choice and their interaction: determining total sexual selection. *Journal of*

578           *Evolutionary Biology* 22:13-26.

579

580   Klingenberg, C. P., V. Debat, D. A. Roff. 2010. Quantitative genetics of shape in cricket wings:

581           developmental integration in a functional structure. *Evolution* 64:2935-2951.

582

583   Kraaijeveld, K., F. J. L. Kraaijeveld-Smit, and M. E. Maan. 2011. Sexual selection and

584           speciation: the comparative evidence revisited. *Biological Reviews* 86:367-377.

585

586   Lande, R. 1981. Models of speciation by sexual selection on polygenic traits. *Proceedings of*

587           the National Academy of Sciences, USA 78:3721-3725.

588

589   Masta, S. E., and W. P. Maddison. 2002. Sexual selection driving diversification in jumping

590           spiders. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA* 99:4442-4447.

591

592 Mendelson, T. C., and K. L. Shaw. 2005. Rapid speciation in an arthropod. *Nature* 433:375-

593 376.

594

595 Møller, A. P., and A. Pomiankowski. 1993. Why have birds got multiple sexual ornaments?

596 *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 32:167-176.

597

598 Moradian, N. R., and S. E. Walker. 2008. Relationships between body size and sound-

599 producing structures in crickets: do large males have large harps? *Invertebrate*

600 *Biology* 127:444-451.

601

602 Otte, D., and R. D. Alexander. 1983. The Australian crickets (Orthoptera: Gryllidae). Academy

603 of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia. Philadelphia, PA.

604

605 Ower, G. D., Hunt, J., and S. K. Sakaluk. 2016. Multivariate sexual selection on male tegmina

606 in wild populations of sagebrush crickets, *Cyphoderris strepitans* (Orthoptera:

607 Haglidae). *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 30:338-351.

608

609 Pascoal, S., Mendrok, M., Mitchell, C., Wilson, A.J., Hunt, J., and N. W. Bailey. 2016. Sexual

610 selection and population divergence I. The influence of socially flexible cuticular

611 hydrocarbon expression in male field crickets (*Teleogryllus oceanicus*). *Evolution*

612 70:82-97.

613

614 Peakall, R., and P. E. Smouse. 2012. GenAlEx 6.5: genetic analysis in Excel. Population

615           genetic software for teaching and research—an update. *Bioinformatics* 28:2537-  
616           2539.

617

618   Pitchers, W. R., C. P. Klingenberg, T. Tregenza, J. Hunt, and I. Dworkin. 2014. The potential  
619           influence of morphology on the evolutionary divergence of an acoustic signal.  
620           *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 27:2163-2176.

621

622   Pomiankowski, A., and Y. Iwasa. 1993. Evolution of multiple sexual preferences by Fisher's  
623           runaway process of sexual selection. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, B*  
624           253:173-181.

625

626   Prokop, Z. M., and S. M. Drobniak. 2016. Genetic variation in male attractiveness: It is time  
627           to see the forest for the trees. *Evolution* 70:913-921.

628

629   Ragge, D. R. 1955. *The wing-venation of the Orthoptera Saltatoria*. Adlard and Son, Ltd.  
630           Surrey, UK.

631

632   Raymond, M., and F. Rousset. 1995. GENEPOP (version 1.2): population genetics software  
633           for exact tests and ecumenicism. *Journal of Heredity* 86:248-249.

634

635   Ritchie, M. G. 2007. Sexual selection and speciation. *Annual Reviews in Ecology and*  
636           *Systematics* 38:79-102.

637

638   Rodríguez, R. L., J. W. Boughman, D. A. Gray, E. A. Hebets, G. Höbel, and L. B. Symes. 2013.

639 Diversification under sexual selection: the relative roles of mate preference strength  
640 and the degree of divergence in mate preferences. *Ecology Letters* 16:964-974.  
641

642 Rohlf, F. J. 2005. tpsDig, digitize landmarks and outlines, version 2.05. Department of  
643 Ecology and Evolution, State University of New York at Stony Brook.  
644

645 Rohlf, F.J., and D. Slice. 1990. Extensions of the Procrustes method for the optimal  
646 superimposition of landmarks. *Systematic Zoology* 39:40-59.  
647

648 Rousset, F. 2008. Genepop'007: a complete reimplementation of the Genepop software for  
649 Windows and Linux. *Molecular Ecology Resources* 8:103-106.  
650

651 Rowe, C. 1999. Receiver psychology and the evolution of multicomponent signals. *Animal*  
652 *Behaviour* 58:921-931.  
653

654 Simmons, L. W., M. G. Ritchie. 1996. Symmetry in the songs of crickets. *Proceedings of the*  
655 *Royal Society of London, Series B* 263:1305-1311.  
656

657 Simmons, L. W., M. L. Thomas, B. Gray, M. Zuk. 2014. Replicated evolutionary divergence in  
658 the cuticular hydrocarbon profile of male crickets associated with the loss of song in  
659 the Hawaiian archipelago. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 27:2249-2257.  
660

661 Simmons, L. W., M. Zuk, J. T. Rotenberry. 2001. Geographic variation in female preference  
662 functions and male songs of the field cricket *Teleogryllus oceanicus*. *Evolution*

663 55:1386-1394.

664

665 Steiger, S., G. D. Ower, J. Stökl, C. Mitchell, J. Hunt, and S. K. Sakaluk. 2013. Sexual selection

666 on cuticular hydrocarbons of male sagebrush crickets in the wild. *Proceedings of the*

667 *Royal Society of London, Series B* 280:1773.

668

669 Svensson, E. I., and T. P. Gosden. 2007. Contemporary evolution of secondary sexual traits in

670 the wild. *Functional Ecology* 21:422-433.

671

672 Thomas, M. L., and L. W. Simmons. 2009. Sexual selection on cuticular hydrocarbons in the

673 Australian field cricket, *Teleogryllus oceanicus*. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 9:162.

674

675 Thomas, M. L., and L. W. Simmons. 2010. Cuticular hydrocarbons influence female

676 attractiveness to males in the Australian field cricket, *Teleogryllus oceanicus*. *Journal*

677 *of Evolutionary Biology* 23:707-714.

678

679 Tinghitella, R. M., M. Zuk, M. Beveridge, and L. W. Simmons. 2011. Island hopping

680 introduces Polynesian field crickets to novel environments, genetic bottlenecks and

681 rapid evolution. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 24:1199-1211.

682

683 Tregenza, T., and N. Wedell. 1997. Definitive evidence for cuticular pheromones in a cricket.

684 *Animal Behaviour* 54:979-984.

685

686 Uetz, G. W., J. A. Roberts, and P. W. Taylor. 2009. Multimodal communication and mate

687 choice in wolf spiders: female response to multimodal versus unimodal signals.  
 688 Animal Behaviour 78:299-305.  
 689  
 690 Uy, J. A. C., R. G. Moyle, and C. E. Filardi. 2008. Plumage and song differences mediate  
 691 species recognition between incipient flycatcher species of the Solomon Islands.  
 692 Evolution 63:153-164.  
 693  
 694 Veltsos, P., C. Wicker-Thomas, R. K. Butlin, A. Hoikkala, and M. G. Ritchie. 2011. Sexual  
 695 selection on song and cuticular hydrocarbons in two distinct population of  
 696 *Drosophila montana*. Ecology and Evolution 2:80-94.  
 697  
 698 Verity, R., and R. A. Nichols. 2014. What is genetic differentiation, and how should we  
 699 measure it— $G_{ST}$ ,  $D$ , neither, or both? Molecular Ecology 23:4216-4225.  
 700  
 701 Visscher, P. M. 2006. A note on the asymptotic distribution of likelihood ratio tests to test  
 702 variance components. Twin Research and Human Genetics 9:490-495.  
 703  
 704 Webster, M., and H. D. Sheets. 2010. A practical introduction to landmark-based geometric  
 705 morphometrics. In: Quantitative Methods in Paleobiology, pp. 163-188. The  
 706 Paleontological Society Papers, volume 16, John Alroy and Gene Hunt (eds.)  
 707  
 708 West-Eberhard, M. J. 1983. Sexual selection, social competition, and speciation. The  
 709 Quarterly Review of Biology 58:155-183.

710

711     Zelditch, M. L. 2012. <http://www.canisius.edu/~sheets/morphsoft.html>

## TABLES

**Table 1.** Analysis of divergence in songs, CHCs and wing morphology across populations in *T. oceanicus*. We started the analysis of each trait type by running a multivariate linear model including each of the 5 sub-traits per type (described in the main text) as the response variables. Each multivariate model was then followed by separate univariate linear models for each sub-trait to determine how these individual traits contribute to the overall multivariate difference between populations.

	Trait	df <sup>1</sup>	F	P
calling song	Multivariate	30,321.5	7.07	<0.0001
	Univariate			
	LONG CHIRPS	6,130	5.73	<0.0001
	SHORT CHIRPS	6,130	19.20	<0.0001
	FREQUENCY	6,129	3.50	<0.0001
	LC-SC INTERVAL	6,130	6.40	<0.0001
	INTER-SONG INTERVAL	6,130	3.56	<0.0001
cuticular hydrocarbons	Multivariate	30,2004.4	58.53	<0.0001
	Univariate			
	CHC1	6,761	36.08	<0.0001
	CHC2	6,761	25.47	<0.0001
	CHC3	6,761	68.33	<0.0001
	CHC4	6,761	18.37	<0.0001
	CHC5	6,761	13.72	<0.0001
wing morphology	Multivariate	30,1969.8	33.30	<0.0001
	Univariate			
	RWA1	6,748	11.85	<0.0001
	RWA2	6,748	67.63	<0.0001
	RWA3	6,748	24.34	0.0030
	MIRROR	6,748	55.87	<0.0001
	HARP	6,748	35.23	0.0027

<sup>1</sup> (numerator,denominator)




724 Table 2: The among-population variance-covariance matrix (**D**) among trait means for song, CHC and wing morphology traits showing among-  
725 population variances (shaded diagonal) and covariances (above diagonal), as well as corresponding correlations (below diagonal). 95% CIs are  
726 provided in brackets and bold font denotes statistically significant parameters (based on 95% CIs not overlapping zero).

		calling song					cuticular hydrocarbons					wing morphology				
		LONG CHIRPS	SHORT CHIRPS	FREQUENCY	LC-SC INTERVAL	INTER-SONG INTERVAL	CHC1	CHC2	CHC3	CHC4	CHC5	RWA1	RWA2	RWA3	MIRROR	HARP
calling song	LONG CHIRPS	<b>0.224</b> (0.118,0.445)	<b>-0.306</b> (-0.461,-0.182)	-0.074 (-0.184,0.033)	0.056 (-0.062,0.169)	0.046 (-0.044,0.183)	<b>-0.118</b> (-0.226,-0.05)	<b>0.106</b> (0.045,0.206)	<b>-0.186</b> (-0.295,-0.074)	-0.037 (-0.111,0.038)	<b>0.066</b> (0.012,0.153)	<b>-0.062</b> (-0.143,-0.009)	<b>-0.228</b> (-0.345,-0.133)	<b>0.089</b> (0.018,0.18)	<b>-0.171</b> (-0.285,-0.083)	<b>-0.19</b> (-0.276,-0.102)
	SHORT CHIRPS	<b>-0.896</b> (-0.967,-0.607)	<b>0.521</b> (0.368,0.777)	0.088 (-0.067,0.208)	-0.017 (-0.153,0.129)	-0.037 (-0.21,0.074)	<b>0.248</b> (0.171,0.339)	<b>-0.188</b> (-0.259,-0.102)	<b>0.404</b> (0.318,0.515)	<b>0.171</b> (0.097,0.248)	<b>-0.173</b> (-0.264,-0.118)	<b>0.136</b> (0.063,0.205)	<b>0.429</b> (0.342,0.538)	-0.01 (-0.081,0.078)	<b>0.362</b> (0.288,0.476)	<b>0.322</b> (0.238,0.409)
	FREQUENCY	-0.411 (-0.737,0.137)	0.321 (-0.179,0.629)	<b>0.145</b> (0.057,0.354)	-0.015 (-0.13,0.097)	-0.058 (-0.16,0.043)	<b>0.125</b> (0.036,0.22)	<b>-0.103</b> (-0.188,-0.018)	0.001 (-0.122,0.108)	-0.023 (-0.097,0.053)	-0.04 (-0.111,0.024)	0.047 (-0.013,0.116)	0.109 (-0.012,0.218)	<b>-0.081</b> (-0.16,-0.001)	0.102 (-0.011,0.205)	<b>0.11</b> (0.009,0.187)
	LC-SC INTERVAL	0.236 (-0.22,0.557)	-0.047 (-0.378,0.299)	-0.08 (-0.48,0.407)	<b>0.252</b> (0.132,0.478)	<b>0.17</b> (0.069,0.299)	-0.033 (-0.133,0.05)	0.054 (-0.027,0.14)	0.046 (-0.055,0.159)	<b>0.095</b> (0.043,0.192)	<b>-0.088</b> (-0.165,-0.031)	<b>0.109</b> (0.033,0.16)	-0.048 (-0.147,0.075)	<b>0.082</b> (0.025,0.178)	-0.026 (-0.117,0.099)	-0.009 (-0.102,0.079)
	INTER-SONG INTERVAL	0.259 (-0.185,0.712)	-0.135 (-0.566,0.25)	-0.406 (-0.72,0.197)	<b>0.898</b> (0.468,0.977)	<b>0.143</b> (0.078,0.368)	<b>-0.087</b> (-0.186,-0.007)	<b>0.092</b> (0.022,0.188)	0.023 (-0.114,0.115)	0.059 (-0.022,0.124)	-0.036 (-0.095,0.035)	0.048 (-0.026,0.106)	<b>-0.082</b> (-0.229,-0.004)	0.058 (-0.02,0.142)	-0.071 (-0.204,0.008)	-0.05 (-0.158,0.022)
cuticular hydrocarbons	CHC1	<b>-0.503</b> (-0.736,-0.183)	<b>0.693</b> (0.491,0.806)	<b>0.659</b> (0.224,0.87)	-0.133 (-0.46,0.177)	<b>-0.464</b> (-0.811,-0.112)	<b>0.246</b> (0.199,0.335)	<b>-0.17</b> (-0.221,-0.126)	<b>0.197</b> (0.151,0.26)	<b>0.093</b> (0.041,0.135)	<b>-0.116</b> (-0.161,-0.073)	<b>0.076</b> (0.031,0.118)	<b>0.283</b> (0.243,0.353)	0.024 (-0.028,0.063)	<b>0.279</b> (0.234,0.335)	<b>0.217</b> (0.171,0.266)
	CHC2	<b>0.492</b> (0.221,0.78)	<b>-0.569</b> (-0.721,-0.34)	<b>-0.592</b> (-0.801,-0.11)	0.236 (-0.107,0.543)	<b>0.535</b> (0.159,0.824)	<b>-0.748</b> (-0.883,-0.614)	<b>0.208</b> (0.142,0.268)	<b>-0.085</b> (-0.145,-0.034)	-0.028 (-0.072,0.012)	<b>0.055</b> (0.013,0.099)	<b>-0.084</b> (-0.123,-0.04)	<b>-0.203</b> (-0.267,-0.157)	0.042 (-0.008,0.078)	<b>-0.167</b> (-0.23,-0.122)	<b>-0.13</b> (-0.175,-0.079)
	CHC3	<b>-0.613</b> (-0.794,-0.253)	<b>0.873</b> (0.767,0.952)	0.003 (-0.47,0.331)	0.143 (-0.145,0.463)	0.094 (-0.355,0.45)	<b>0.617</b> (0.477,0.725)	<b>-0.289</b> (-0.466,-0.106)	<b>0.412</b> (0.339,0.509)	<b>0.223</b> (0.161,0.27)	<b>-0.177</b> (-0.237,-0.135)	<b>0.102</b> (0.044,0.146)	<b>0.344</b> (0.297,0.411)	<b>0.117</b> (0.057,0.163)	<b>0.323</b> (0.271,0.384)	<b>0.252</b> (0.202,0.309)
	CHC4	-0.194 (-0.507,0.176)	<b>0.591</b> (0.359,0.773)	-0.153 (-0.568,0.273)	<b>0.472</b> (0.214,0.792)	0.391 (-0.111,0.66)	<b>0.469</b> (0.229,0.62)	-0.155 (-0.392,0.059)	<b>0.866</b> (0.731,0.942)	<b>0.161</b> (0.1,0.215)	<b>-0.115</b> (-0.152,-0.078)	<b>0.074</b> (0.029,0.104)	<b>0.155</b> (0.098,0.209)	<b>0.126</b> (0.081,0.163)	<b>0.162</b> (0.104,0.209)	<b>0.099</b> (0.05,0.142)
	CHC5	<b>0.419</b> (0.068,0.736)	<b>-0.718</b> (-0.885,-0.524)	-0.317 (-0.641,0.18)	<b>-0.523</b> (-0.782,-0.205)	-0.288 (-0.605,0.22)	<b>-0.704</b> (-0.83,-0.477)	<b>0.36</b> (0.1,0.587)	<b>-0.829</b> (-0.932,-0.684)	<b>-0.861</b> (-0.953,-0.686)	<b>0.111</b> (0.074,0.173)	<b>-0.086</b> (-0.12,-0.05)	<b>-0.158</b> (-0.221,-0.111)	<b>-0.06</b> (-0.105,-0.024)	<b>-0.16</b> (-0.207,-0.11)	<b>-0.13</b> (-0.174,-0.087)
wing morphology	RWA1	<b>-0.387</b> (-0.741,-0.103)	<b>0.559</b> (0.292,0.775)	0.366 (-0.092,0.679)	<b>0.645</b> (0.197,0.791)	0.379 (-0.178,0.678)	<b>0.457</b> (0.218,0.675)	<b>-0.544</b> (-0.739,-0.313)	<b>0.472</b> (0.247,0.679)	<b>0.546</b> (0.222,0.703)	<b>-0.768</b> (-0.906,-0.501)	<b>0.114</b> (0.068,0.172)	<b>0.107</b> (0.052,0.156)	0.01 (-0.038,0.04)	<b>0.091</b> (0.042,0.139)	<b>0.09</b> (0.042,0.13)
	RWA2	<b>-0.757</b> (-0.914,-0.483)	<b>0.931</b> (0.817,0.971)	0.451 (-0.024,0.729)	-0.149 (-0.406,0.2)	<b>-0.339</b> (-0.719,-0.02)	<b>0.894</b> (0.804,0.957)	<b>-0.698</b> (-0.821,-0.565)	<b>0.841</b> (0.766,0.908)	<b>0.607</b> (0.396,0.731)	<b>-0.746</b> (-0.868,-0.57)	<b>0.498</b> (0.284,0.699)	<b>0.406</b> (0.346,0.511)	0.024 (-0.029,0.082)	<b>0.369</b> (0.328,0.444)	<b>0.296</b> (0.247,0.36)
	RWA3	<b>0.445</b> (0.084,0.709)	-0.034 (-0.256,0.243)	<b>-0.504</b> (-0.764,-0.023)	<b>0.387</b> (0.13,0.725)	0.366 (-0.042,0.708)	0.116 (-0.13,0.271)	0.216 (-0.033,0.409)	<b>0.432</b> (0.219,0.571)	<b>0.747</b> (0.553,0.871)	<b>-0.429</b> (-0.636,-0.161)	0.071 (-0.256,0.289)	0.089 (-0.113,0.275)	<b>0.178</b> (0.127,0.246)	<b>0.065</b> (0.005,0.105)	-0.008 (-0.055,0.036)
	MIRROR	<b>-0.605</b> (-0.833,-0.315)	<b>0.839</b> (0.713,0.937)	0.445 (-0.018,0.728)	-0.085 (-0.372,0.252)	<b>-0.313</b> (-0.751,-0.015)	<b>0.939</b> (0.849,0.969)	<b>-0.613</b> (-0.768,-0.463)	<b>0.842</b> (0.763,0.909)	<b>0.673</b> (0.478,0.803)	<b>-0.802</b> (-0.899,-0.607)	<b>0.449</b> (0.187,0.627)	<b>0.968</b> (0.923,0.992)	<b>0.257</b> (0.022,0.394)	<b>0.358</b> (0.297,0.451)	<b>0.275</b> (0.224,0.332)
	HARP	<b>-0.793</b> (-0.947,-0.513)	<b>0.882</b> (0.749,0.963)	<b>0.572</b> (0.072,0.762)	-0.037 (-0.37,0.277)	-0.262 (-0.665,0.107)	<b>0.866</b> (0.76,0.937)	<b>-0.564</b> (-0.731,-0.403)	<b>0.776</b> (0.68,0.88)	<b>0.489</b> (0.278,0.666)	<b>-0.769</b> (-0.892,-0.583)	<b>0.525</b> (0.307,0.737)	<b>0.919</b> (0.834,0.963)	-0.039 (-0.246,0.164)	<b>0.909</b> (0.84,0.969)	<b>0.256</b> (0.181,0.319)


727

**Table 3.** Eigendecomposition of the **D** matrix. Only the first six vectors are retained for interpretation as they collectively explain >99.9% of the observed among-population (co)variance in song, CHC and wing morphology traits. 95% CIs are provided in brackets. Estimates of trait loadings are considered statistically significant (bold font) if 95% CIs do not overlap zero (note this is necessarily true for the eigenvalues themselves).


Vector		1	2	3	4	5	6
Eigenvalue		2.372 (2.184, 2.789)	0.680 (0.558, 0.987)	0.297 (0.266, 0.522)	0.269 (0.172, 0.360)	0.101 (0.066, 0.183)	0.016 (0.013, 0.080)
Proportion of variance		0.635 (0.556, 0.659)	0.182 (0.148, 0.239)	0.080 (0.066, 0.123)	0.072 (0.045, 0.089)	0.027 (0.017, 0.044)	0.004 (0.002, 0.019)
Trait load							
calling song	LONG CHIRPS	<b>0.236</b> (0.142, 0.345)	-0.184 (-0.417, 0.054)	-0.188 (-0.647, 0.442)	0.461 (-0.163, 0.631)	0.036 (-0.369, 0.316)	-0.083 (-0.430, 0.530)
	SHORT CHIRPS	<b>-0.446</b> (-0.518, -0.364)	0.015 (-0.175, 0.169)	0.088 (-0.438, 0.470)	-0.402 (-0.557, 0.051)	0.174 (-0.347, 0.353)	-0.211 (-0.550, 0.304)
	FREQUENCY	-0.107 (-0.217, 0.027)	0.235 (-0.065, 0.475)	0.365 (-0.328, 0.725)	0.295 (-0.359, 0.645)	-0.373 (-0.669, 0.031)	-0.466 (-0.604, 0.179)
	LC-SC INTERVAL	0.008 (-0.117, 0.126)	<b>-0.503</b> (-0.704, -0.259)	0.501 (-0.129, 0.655)	0.136 (-0.497, 0.568)	-0.068 (-0.358, 0.332)	0.090 (-0.446, 0.375)
	INTER-SONG INTERVAL	0.054 (-0.032, 0.206)	<b>-0.399</b> (-0.582, -0.171)	0.259 (-0.243, 0.494)	-0.156 (-0.472, 0.348)	-0.036 (-0.477, 0.301)	-0.229 (-0.483, 0.506)
cuticular hydrocarbons	CHC1	<b>-0.280</b> (-0.327, -0.235)	0.116 (-0.022, 0.235)	-0.031 (-0.420, 0.428)	0.424 (-0.026, 0.500)	-0.147 (-0.406, 0.202)	0.099 (-0.255, 0.446)
	CHC2	<b>0.191</b> (0.133, 0.237)	<b>-0.240</b> (-0.332, -0.086)	-0.169 (-0.416, 0.325)	-0.309 (-0.571, 0.169)	<b>-0.692</b> (-0.772, -0.285)	-0.097 (-0.412, 0.479)
	CHC3	<b>-0.367</b> (-0.412, -0.314)	<b>-0.290</b> (-0.378, -0.135)	-0.250 (-0.421, 0.149)	-0.242 (-0.449, 0.214)	-0.028 (-0.283, 0.229)	0.113 (-0.267, 0.435)
	CHC4	<b>-0.172</b> (-0.214, -0.107)	<b>-0.345</b> (-0.400, -0.209)	-0.137 (-0.279, 0.131)	0.065 (-0.175, 0.271)	0.126 (-0.184, 0.300)	-0.316 (-0.493, 0.214)
	CHC5	<b>0.177</b> (0.123, 0.224)	<b>0.200</b> (0.096, 0.281)	-0.117 (-0.256, 0.129)	-0.122 (-0.295, 0.192)	0.124 (0.201, 0.297)	0.029 (-0.380, 0.383)
wing morphology	RWA1	<b>-0.127</b> (-0.174, -0.072)	-0.146 (-0.249, 0.004)	0.402 (-0.071, 0.459)	0.102 (-0.486, 0.500)	0.306 (-0.052, 0.600)	0.263 (-0.202, 0.590)
	RWA2	<b>-0.409</b> (-0.452, -0.366)	0.079 (-0.042, 0.159)	-0.089 (-0.214, 0.091)	0.047 (-0.137, 0.217)	0.081 (-0.125, 0.285)	-0.240 (-0.450, 0.193)
	RWA3	-0.031 (-0.079, 0.034)	<b>-0.391</b> (-0.497, -0.205)	-0.409 (-0.573, 0.236)	0.277 (-0.381, 0.567)	0.081 (-0.225, 0.452)	0.122 (-0.399, 0.385)
	MIRROR	<b>-0.373</b> (-0.413, -0.327)	0.002 (-0.112, 0.118)	-0.180 (-0.337, 0.212)	0.233 (-0.171, 0.351)	-0.174 (-0.361, 0.100)	-0.123 (-0.378, 0.283)
	HARP	<b>-0.310</b> (-0.348, -0.257)	0.064 (-0.049, 0.152)	0.102 (-0.104, 0.218)	0.002 (-0.232, 0.197)	-0.392 (-0.561, 0.049)	<b>0.617</b> (0.011, 0.723)



**Figure 1.** Male *T. oceanicus* traits subject to sexual selection. (A) Oscillogram of a typical male calling song, indicating the temporal parameters measured in the present study (modified from Bailey and Macleod (2014)). The brackets indicated with asterisks highlight a single long chirp (one pulse) and a single short chirp (typically paired pulses). (B) Diagrammatic illustration of a gas chromatograph of a male cuticular hydrocarbon profile. Peaks analysed in the present study are indicated with red arrows. (C) Principal sound-producing structures on the male forewing, adapted from Pascoal et al. (2014). Red circles indicate the 11 landmarks used in this study, which define the harp (green shading), mirror (yellow shading) and scraper (brown shading).



**Figure 2.** Population divergence in three sexually-selected male traits. Canonical variate analyses (CVAs) were used to visualise overall patterns of population divergence for calling song (n = 137), CHC profiles (n = 768), and forewing morphology (n = 755). All five individual traits for each sexual trait type were used in the respective CVAs. Data from the first two canonical variates components are plotted, and the proportion of variance explained by each axis is indicated by the grey text in brackets (see Table S1 for additional statistical details). Centroids for each population are depicted with larger dots. Colour-coding is indicated in the key. Some X-axes are reversed to maintain consistency with other figures.



**Figure 3.** Population variation among the 5 individual traits measured for each modality in male *T. oceanicus*. Means and standard errors are indicated, and colour coding follows Figure 2. Where standard error bars are not visible, it is because they were obscured by the data points. (A) Calling song. The five traits examined in this study; data from Bailey and Macleod (2014) and Pascoal et al. (2016) are shown, and terminology follows Figure 1. (B) Cuticular hydrocarbons. The first five principal components describing relative abundances of 26 CHC peaks; data from Pascoal et al. (2016) are shown. (C) Wing venation. Population

767 variation in the first 3 relative warps describing variation in landmark placement on male  
768 wings are depicted, as well as mean harp and mirror surface area in each population. (D)  
769 Male forewing landmark deformation across all populations. The deformation grid  
770 illustrates the main sources of variation in the shape of sound-producing structures among  
771 populations, and the blue arrows are vectors showing the magnitude and direction of  
772 landmark displacement. Highlighted structures are as in Figure 1C and demonstrate how  
773 landmarks were joined to calculate mirror and harp surface area. Vectors were scaled using  
774 a Procrustes deformation scaling factor of 0.2.

*Online Supporting Information For:*

**SEXUAL SELECTION AND POPULATION DIVERGENCE II.  
DIVERGENCE AMONG DIFFERENT SEXUAL TRAITS AND  
SIGNAL MODALITIES IN FIELD CRICKETS  
(*TELEOGRYLLUS OCEANICUS*)**

**Sonia Pascoal<sup>1</sup>, Magdalena Mendrok<sup>2</sup>, Alastair J. Wilson<sup>3</sup>, John Hunt<sup>3,4</sup>, Nathan W. Bailey<sup>5,6</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> *Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, Downing Street, Cambridge, CB2 3EJ, United Kingdom*

<sup>2</sup> *Institute of Environmental Sciences, Jagellonian University, Gronostajowa 7, 30-387 Kraków, Poland*

<sup>3</sup> *Centre for Ecology and Conservation, School of Biosciences, University of Exeter, Cornwall Campus, TR10 9EZ, United Kingdom*

<sup>4</sup> *School of Science and Health and Hawkesbury Institute for the Environment, Western Sydney University, Penrith, NSW, 2751, Australia*


<sup>5</sup> *Centre for Biological Diversity, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, KY16 9TH, United Kingdom*

<sup>6</sup> *E-mail: nwb3@st-andrews.ac.uk*

## Contents

p. 1	.....	<b>Figure S1.</b> Validations of wing morphometric measurements.
p. 2	.....	<b>Table S1.</b> Details of canonical variates axes for each sexual trait type.
p. 3	.....	<b>Table S2.</b> Models evaluating neutral vs. non-neutral divergence.





**Figure S1:** Graphs illustrating methodological validations of wing morphometrics. Blind validations were carried out on a randomly-chosen subset of 50 individual male wings. Technical replicability was assessed by recalculating mirror (top row) and harp (bottom row) surface areas. Graphs on the left show the correlation between original and blind validation measurements, in which surface area was measured by enclosing boundary landmarks within a convex polygon and calculating its area. Graphs on the right show the correlation between two methods of calculating surface area: the polygon method, and manually outlining the exact structure in question followed by calculation of the enclosed area. Both sets of comparisons utilise the same validation data for the polygon method indicated by the y-axes. Statistics were calculated using Pearson product-moment correlations, and data were checked for normality and homogeneity of variances (all  $P > 0.505$ ).

**Table S1.** Canonical variate axes for each sexual trait type (song, CHCs and wings), derived from analyses in which “population” is the classification variable.

Trait	Function	Eigenvalue	% Variance	Wilks' $\lambda^a$	Chi-square	df	P
calling song	1	1.142	67.0	0.283	164.192	30	<0.001
	2	0.340	19.9	0.606	65.176	20	<0.001
	3	0.160	9.4	0.812	27.146	12	0.007
	4	0.056	3.3	0.942	7.817	6	0.252
	5	0.006	0.3	0.994	0.764	2	0.682
cuticular hydrocarbons	1	2.037	85.3	0.40	1086.266	30	<0.001
	2	0.277	11.6	0.729	240.841	20	<0.001
	3	0.034	1.4	0.930	55.052	12	<0.001
	4	0.030	1.3	0.961	29.901	6	<0.001
	5	0.009	0.4	0.991	7.138	2	0.028
wing morphology	1	0.925	68.8	0.356	771.769	30	<0.001
	2	0.312	23.2	0.686	282.049	20	<0.001
	3	0.068	5.1	0.900	78.768	12	<0.001
	4	0.027	2.0	0.961	29.570	6	<0.001
	5	0.013	1.0	0.987	9.529	2	0.009

<sup>a</sup> The null hypothesis is that the canonical correlation of the given function, plus all functions following it, are not significantly different from zero.

**Table S2.** Univariate mixed model results showing estimated among-population variance partitioned into components attributable to neutral processes ( $V_{POP(neutral)}$ ) and putative selection ( $V_{POP(sel)}$ ) as well as residual (within-population,  $V_R$ ) for each trait. Also shown are likelihood ratio tests comparing model fit to a reduced model in which all among-population variance is attributable to neutral processes. Standard errors are shown in parentheses (note – denotes a SE that was non-estimable due to the variance component being bound to zero in the REML solution).

	Trait	$V_{POP(neutral)}$	$V_{POP(sel)}$	$V_R$	$\chi^2_{0,1}$	P
calling song	LONG CHIRPS	0.379 (0.413)	0.016 (0.075)	0.827 (0.103)	0.069	0.397
	SHORT CHIRPS	0.697 (0.485)	0.000 (-)	0.553 (0.068)	0.000	0.500
	FREQUENCY	0.000 (-)	0.115 (0.093)	0.900 (0.112)	1.991	0.079
	LC-SC INTERVAL	0.000 (-)	0.225 (0.154)	0.808 (0.100)	0.000	0.500
	INTER-SONG INTERVAL	0.449 (0.386)	0.000 (-)	0.895 (0.111)	0.000	0.500
cuticular hydrocarbons	CHC1	0.334 (0.405)	0.081 (0.093)	0.785 (0.040)	1.879	0.085
	CHC2	0.194 (0.414)	0.119 (0.128)	0.840 (0.043)	0.729	0.197
	CHC3	0.954 (0.577)	0.000 (-)	0.660 (0.034)	0.000	0.500
	CHC4	0.514 (0.328)	0.000 (-)	0.879 (0.045)	0.000	0.500
	CHC5	0.232 (0.239)	0.012 (0.036)	0.909 (0.047)	0.172	0.339
wing morphology	RWA1	0.303 (0.205)	0.000 (-)	0.920 (0.048)	0.000	0.500
	RWA2	0.447 (0.275)	0.000 (-)	0.653 (0.034)	0.000	0.500
	RWA3	0.000 (-)	0.172 (0.104)	0.843 (0.044)	1.848	0.087
	MIRROR	0.536 (0.448)	0.021 (0.052)	0.696 (0.036)	0.304	0.291
	HARP	0.321 (0.276)	0.022 (0.039)	0.786 (0.041)	0.808	0.184